

***Semtek International, Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, et al*, Case No. 97183023/CC 3762, 2003 MDBT 5 (Circuit Court for Baltimore City)(February 11, 2003)(per Albert J. Matricciani, Jr.)**

**Lockheed filed a notice of intention to rely on the law of Massachusetts pursuant to §10-504 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article. Semtek filed a motion to preclude the application of Massachusetts law. Semtek argued that (1) Lockheed failed to provide reasonable notice of an intent to rely on Massachusetts law; (2) Lockheed was judicially estopped from relying on Massachusetts law; and (3) under the *lex loci delecti* doctrine, the wrong occurred in Maryland and hence Maryland law would apply.**

**Held: Judgment for Lockheed.**

**Synopsis: Lockheed provided reasonable notice as required by §10-504; thus Lockheed complied with the notice requirements. Judicial estoppel is inapplicable because there is no evidence of intentionality or unfair advantage. The *lex loci delecti* doctrine provides that the law of the jurisdiction where the injury was sustained should be applied. The pecuniary harm was felt in Massachusetts and thus the law of that state applies.**

**Counsel:** Jack D. Lebowitz, Esq.  
Vadium A. Mzhen, Esq.  
Andrew W. Zepeda, Esq.  
Leslie N. Rgizes, Esq.  
Francis B. Burch, Jr., Esq.  
Anthony L. Meagher, Esq.  
Brett Ingerman, Esq.  
Robert E. Willett, Esq.  
Richard W. Buckner, Esq.  
Jess B. Frost, Esq.  
Thomas V. Girardi, Esq.  
Walter K. Lack, Esq.  
Steven C. Shuman, Esq.

**Related cases: 2003 MDBT 4; 2003 MDBT 8; *Semtek International v. Lockheed*, No. 1930 (September Term 2003)(Court of Special Appeals)**